

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

favor, as compared with Francis Joseph and others, is that the power of mischief which he held in his hands was so much greater than theirs that the fact that he did not actively employ it for evil seems to stand for a superior order of virtue.

If, on the other hand, Alexander had been a peace man in the true sense of the term, there are at least three things which he would have done, or at any rate attempted to do. The general impression throughout the civilized world-an impression justly growing out of Russia's past conduct-is, that she has her eye on Constantinople, and cherishes a fixed purpose to appropriate it to herself when a suitable opportunity offers; that she proposes, further, to extend her territory on the side of Afghanistan, and that she is watching eagerly her chances to push her frontiers down the coast of the Pacific in the extreme east. There is no evidence, so far as we know, that the late Emperor ever seriously attempted to repress this historic desire of Russia to extend, by violence, if need be, her territory. On the contrary, along with his predecessors on the throne, he seems to have cherished this desire for territorial extension as a part of the "manifest destiny" of his country. This was certainly not a peace tendency in him, but one of the worst forms of war tendency.

Again, if he had been an intelligent peace man, he would have done something for the relief of the persecuted Stundists and Jews of Russia. Russian liberty made little or no apparent progress during his reign, and where liberty is trampled under foot there can be no genuine peace. The seeds of civil war are thick all over the Empire, and must some day bear fruit, unless the policy of the government shall be changed.

Another thing which the Emperor might have done was to check the further development of Russian armament. Whatever apparent justification may be offered for the military development of certain other countries of Europe, Russia has absolutely not the shadow of an excuse for the course which she is pursuing. No other country wants any of her possessions, or has the remotest idea of attacking her. But little of her territory would be accepted by another, if offered without compensation; yet she has increased her military strength until she has more than a million soldiers actually under arms, and a fleet outranked by those of not more than two other powers. The refurnishing of her army with the best modern magazine guns is rapidly nearing completion.

The militarism of Russia has its root in aggression almost pure and simple, and its enormous development has gone on right under the eye of the Czar, with no protest from him. If he had strongly desired it and urged it, Russia might have led the way, single-handed, to an immediate European disarmament, which would have lifted from the civilized world the heaviest curse that has ever burdened it. As it is, his death leaves Europe in a

worse condition than he found it on his accession to the throne, and his own country the chief menace to the peace. It may be said in extenuation that his hands were tied by the military aristocracy, and that he could not have done differently. Such was his character that this is, doubtless, in part true, but just to the extent to which it is true was he, in consequence, incapable of doing anything in reality for the peace of Europe.

We have all along believed and said that the weight of the Czar's influence for peace has been greatly overestimated, and that the predictions of a probable early outbreak of hostilities after his death were for the most part sentimental fabrications. Events so far since his death have justified our belief. War, of course, may break out in the near future; but, if it should, we are disposed to think that Alexander III. will have been much more the cause of it than he has been the cause of the preservation of peace up to the time of his death.

THE UNITED STATES STRIKE COMMISSION.

The Commission named by President Cleveland on the 26th of July last, to investigate the Chicago strike, has made its report. The Commission consisted of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor at Washington, Hon. John D. Kernan of New York, and Hon. Nicholas E. Worthington of Illinois. The report covers fifty-three printed pages, not including the minutes of the testimony taken, which are to be published separately. The Commission was appointed under the authorization of section 6 of chapter 1063 of the laws of the United States, passed October 1st, 1888, the Commissioner of Labor being designated in the said statute to serve as chairman of any such temporary Commission. The Commission found the \$5000 appropriated for its use "amply sufficient" to meet expenses.

The Commission met in Chicago on the 15th of August and continued in session thirteen days, during which it examined 107 witnesses. Two more witnesses were afterward examined at Washington, on the 26th of September. The purpose of the Commission was twofold, to determine the facts and causes of the strike, and to make such recommendations as they should think proper as to the prevention of such conflicts in the future. The investigation of the inception, progress and outcome of the great strike has been thoroughly and conscientiously made by the Commission, and its account may be accepted as true to the facts. The most of these facts are too well known to need repetition. As to the blame for the strike and for its development and unfortunate results, we are not surprised that the report bears very heavily on the Pullman Company and the General Managers' Asso-During the progress of the ciation of the railways. strike, when the newspapers of the country were for the most part laying nearly the whole of the blame on the

Pullman employees, and exculpating the Pullman Company, there were to many thoughtful minds evidences of an unmistakable kind that the chief blame for the beginning of the strike was not with the workmen. This report, by bringing out clearly the underlying facts, locates the blame where it really belongs, and the judgment of the country at large, as it studies the report, will agree largely with that of the Commissioners.

The points made against the Pullman Company by the report are these: From September 18th, 1893, to May 1st, 1894, "the percentage of loss borne by labor in the reduction of wages was much greater than that sustained by the company on material"; the uniform reduction of wages in the contract department and the repair department was unfair, because it was in the former of these departments that the chief loss to the company occurred; none of the salaries of the officers, managers or superintendents were reduced, though wages were reduced on the average 25 per cent.; rents, which were 20 to 25 per cent. higher at Pullman than for like accommodations in surrounding towns, were not reduced when the reduction in wages came; no notice of the reductions of wages was given to the workmen until they took effect; the company offered to produce its accounts in reference to contracts taken at less than cost but no others, "the purpose of the management being obviously to rest the whole matter upon cost, etc., in its most seriously crippled department"; the company refused over and over again all proposals for arbitration or conciliation, not only those coming from its employees, but those made by the Common Council of Chicago, and those of the Civic Federation of Chicago, "composed of eminent citizens in all kinds of business and from all grades of respectable society."

The following passage from the report gives the judgment of the Commissioners as to the benevolent feelings of the Pullman Company:

"In its statements to the public, which are in evidence, the company represents that its object in all it did was to continue operations for the benefit of its workmen and of tradespeople in and about Pullman, and to save the public from the annoyance of interrupted travel. The Commission thinks that the evidence shows that it sought to keep running mainly for its own benefit as a manufacturer, that its plant might not rust, that its competitors might not invade its territory, that it might keep its cars in repair, that it might be ready for resumption when business revived with a live plant and competent help, and that its revenue from its tenements might continue."

The Commissioners think that the demand of the employees for the old wages was clearly unjustifiable, but that the reduction was carried to excess. "The company had a legal right to take the position which it did in regard to rent, but as between man and man the demand for some rent reduction was fair and reasonable under all the circumstances."

In speaking of the self-restraint of the strikers at Pull-

man, and of the protection of the Company's property for nearly two months by three hundred strikers who were placed about the property, the report says: "Such dignified, manly and conservative conduct in the midst of excitement and threatened starvation is worthy of the highest type of American citizenship."

The Commissioners find that the American Railway Union was largely responsible for the riots and destruction of life and property, though the Association, its leaders, and to a large extent the railroad men on strike had nothing directly to do with these disorders, which were mostly committed by the hoodlums and lawless classes. The railroad strike was wrong, being purely a sympathetic one, the railroad men having no grievances of their own. A number of the strikers were found to have participated in the riots. The Union is farther censured for admitting the Pullman employees into its membership, as they were not "persons employed in railway service." This was a violation of the constitution of the Union.

The police, as a body, are considered to have been "courageous and efficient," and the military to have confined itself to dispersing mobs and protecting property. The 3600 United States deputy marshals employed "were selected by and appointed at the request of the General Managers' Association, and of its railroads." "They were armed and paid by the railroads" and were really acting under their direction. "They were not under the direct control of any government official while exercising authority." The Commission is certainly right in considering this "placing officers of the government under control of a combination of railroads" as "a bad precedent."

What the report has to say of the General Managers' Association has been much criticised in some quarters. But we think after having read more than once the text of the report, that the critics have failed to comprehend its real meaning. It is the General Managers' Association as such, an extra-legal association, wielding the power of 24 different railroad corporations and in which these separate corporations have practically disappeared as independently acting bodies, that the Commissioners find fault with. They do not say that the railroads ought to have boycotted the Pullman Company by refusing to haul its cars nor that they might not very properly have combined temporally to defeat the strike. But they hint pretty loudly that the existence of such a powerful association with which individual employers had really to do, rather than with the railroad professedly employing them, was one of the causes of the existence of the Railway Union and hence of the sympathetic strike. "The refusal of the General Managers' Association to recognize and deal with such a combination of labor as the American Railway Union seems arrogant and absurd" to the Commissioners, because the Association would not grant to the Union in the interests of its members the rights which it constantly claimed and exercised in the interests of the individual corporations of which it itself was compared. It refused to swallow its own prescription, which was "absurd." It stood upon its power simply, which was "arrogant." It may be and was a fortunate incident of this Association's power that the country was freed from the disastrous influence of the great strike, but to confess this is not to touch at all the real force of the Commissioners' criticism. The General Managers' Association is one of the chief causes of the very evil which it itself assisted in putting down, and therefore ought never to have existed. Christ's betrayal by Judas saved the world, but Judas was not on that account a saint.

The closing pages of the report, under the head of "Conclusions and Recommendations," are extremely sensible. The war of strikes is strongly condemned. Arbitration and conciliation are recommended as the only wise way of dealing with industrial conflicts. Labor Unions should be recognized by law, but both they and corporations should be put under proper restrictions and regulations. The Commission does not deem it proper to suggest any specific remedies for labor troubles, such as government control of railways, etc. All such questions "need to be well studied in every aspect by all citizens." Three recommendations are made as follows:

- 1. The creation of a permanent United States Strike Commission of three members, with the necessary powers of investigation and recommendation, power being given to the United States courts to compel railroads to obey its decisions, each side in a controversy having the right to select a representative who shall be appointed by the President to serve as a temporary member of the Commission
- 2. The adoption by the several States of some system of conciliation and arbitration like that in use in Massachusetts.
- 3. That Employers recognize labor organizations and deal with them through representatives with special reference to conciliation and arbitration.

PERSONAL MENTION.

The death of Hon. Robert C. Winthrop removes one of the oldest and most eminent of the citizens of Massachusetts. He was a descendant of the first John Winthrop and was born May 12, 1809, the year in which so many famous men of this country saw the light. He was graduated from Harvard in 1827. He studied law in the office of Daniel Webster, though he never practised. He entered public life in 1834 as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature. He was a member of Congress for ten years from 1840 to 1850. In the 30th Congress he was Speaker of the House. In 1850 when Webster became Secretary of State he was named by the Gover-

nor to the vacant place in the Senate. His course on the slavery question dissatisfied both the extreme radicals and the extreme conservatives. He was consequently defeated in his candidacy for the Senate, and afterwards for the Governorship of Massachusetts. He then retired from public life and gave himself up to literary, historical and philanthropic work. He was president or the Massachusetts Historical Society for 25 years and of the Harvard Alumni for eight years. He was an orator of marked ability and was often called upon to speak on great historical occasions, both State and National. His addresses and speeches have been published in four volumes.

Mr. Winthrop was by nature a man of pacific tendencies, and when in Congress strongly advocated the policy of international arbitration, introducing into the House one of the first resolutions ever offered on the subject. For many years he had been a vice-president of the American Peace Society and signed a large number of certificates of life members. He was a man of large attainments and noble character and died greatly honored by all who knew him.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

This number closes the 56th volume of the Advocate. We have tried during the year to make the paper fresh and strong, and to have its pages faithfully record the work done in the interests of peace and arbitration in different countries. The task is no light one, as the centres of work are so widely separated, and we are conscious that many items must have escaped our attention. We have tried to discuss, in editorials and editorial notes, in an earnest but fair and courteous way, the various phases of the subject, as occasion has brought them forward. With what effectiveness this has been done, our readers have been able to judge. Letters received from time to time indicate that our efforts have been appreciated.

We are anxious during the coming year to put the Advocate into the hands of a much larger number of readers. A considerable number of persons have recently become members of the American Peace Society, and the list of subscribers to the Advocate has been lately steadily increasing. But the present list ought to be more than doubled during the next two or three months. Will not every reader of the paper make a faithful effort to induce some friend to take it, and to become permanently identified with the cause which it represents?

Though our work is in no sense a money-making scheme, we give liberal commissions to those who are willing to become agents in increasing the circulation of the ADVOCATE.

Much of our work is carried on by the gratuitous circulation of literature, including the Advocate, which is sent, through the aid received from donations, to many educa-